

Application No.: 10/005,862

Docket No.: 20136-00328-US

REMARKS

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Agrawal et al. (EP 0 895 169 A2), is requested. The present invention as exemplified by the rejected claims is directed to a process and system for managing an integrated information technology system. The claimed process and system is directed to an IT system having a plurality of components which have a relative value for the system. In order to assess the value of each component in a system, various steps and apparatus are used to determine the particular role a component plays in a system, so that its value may be assessed.

Claim 1 sets forth the claimed process as:

collecting at each of the components usage data indicated an amount of use each component receives in providing each of the services;

reporting the usage data of each component for each service;

constructing evaluation function for valuing each service;

correlating each service with each component used to provide the service;

determining from the correlated services and components the value of each component and the value of the it system.

In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claim.

Item 5 of the Office Action supporting the rejection indicates that the step of:

Collecting at each of the components usage data indicating an amount of use each component receives in providing each of the services as being disclosed in the cited reference.

In reviewing the cited reference, pages 1-18 thereof, as well as each of the drawing figures, it is noted that there is no reference or description of any component which makes up a integrated information technology system, nor any method or device for determining its usage.

Application No.: 10/005,862

Docket No.: 20136-00328-US

Col. 1, lines 15-23, which allegedly discloses this feature, discloses a workflow management system for modeling and executing various business processes. The column, as does the remaining portion of the reference, fails to disclose any component of any integrated information technology system. Instead, the workflow management systems (WFMS) are directed more towards the simulation and evaluation of business processes, not the components used in any type of integrated information technology system.

The limitation of "reporting the usage data of each component" is likewise not disclosed in any portion of the cited document. Col. 7, lines 45-58, col. 8, in its entirety, fails to disclose any reporting of usage data for any component. Instead, what is described is the modeling of a business process in a workflow management system. The various features of a process model are described in detail, without reference to any component or reporting of any usage data of a component.

The limitation of "constructing an evaluation function for valuing each service" is alleged to be shown in Figs. 1 and 3. However, referring now to each of the figures of the cited reference, they show only the process for creating an audit trail and for data mining the resulting audit trail so that better process model information may be developed. Nowhere in the cited columns of 7, 11, 14, 15, 17 and 18 can it be determined that there is any evaluation function for valuing the service. The entire focus of the reference is to develop a more accurate process model, not to value any service carried out by a model process.

The limitation of "correlating each service with a component used to provide the service" is alleged to be in Figs. 1 and 3, cols. 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. However, in reviewing each of these columns and figures, there is no reference whatsoever to any component used to provide any service. Further, there is no mention of correlating a service with a component to provide the service.

Finally, the steps for determining from the correlated services and components the evaluation of a component remains wholly undisclosed in either the cited portions of the reference contained in the Office Action, or in any other portion of the reference. From

Application No.: 10/005,862

Docket No.: 20136-00328-US

beginning to end, including drawing figures, the reference fails to disclose any component, or any ability to correlate a service to a component and derive a valuation for the component.

The limitations contained in each of claims 2-9, dependent on claim 1, all require that a value be determined. Further, claim 4 requires a relationship table identifying components used in providing each service. Nowhere throughout the cited reference is there any table, let alone a relationship table which identifies components (as noted earlier, not shown anywhere or described in the reference) for providing a service.

System claims 10-16 are similarly undisclosed and unanticipated by the cited reference. System claim 10 require there be an agent associated with each of the components for collecting information regarding the agents transaction information for each service performed. As noted previously, the reference fails to disclose anywhere any component of an IT infra structure, and additionally fails to disclose any agent associated with each of the components as set forth in claim 10 and 12, and those dependent thereon (11, 13-16).

From the foregoing, it is clear that the cited reference fails to disclose any of the limitations of the rejected claims. It is requested that the Examiner reconsider the Final Rejection in light of these observations.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 20136-00328-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

9/11/03

Respectfully submitted,

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 12 2003

By


George R. Pettit, Reg. No. 27,369

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036-3425
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)

OFFICIAL